

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/773,749	-	02/06/2004	Matthias Braun	BRAUN-8	BRAUN-8 5589	
20151	7590	08/25/2006		EXAMINER		
		EISEN, LLC		HARRIS, A	ANTON B	
350 FIFTH SUITE 471				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YOR	K, NY 1	0118		2831		
				DATE MAILED: 08/25/2000	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	Office Action Summer:	10/773,749	BRAUN ET AL.	_				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Anton B. Harris	2831					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC  16(a). In no event, however, may a refill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB	CATION.  Peply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 Ju</u>	ine 2006						
,		action is non-final.						
	<del>/ -</del>							
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under E	•	·					
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.							
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.							
=	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
	on Papers	•						
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r						
			by the Everniner					
ا_ا(۱۰	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • •	, , ,	4١				
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			a).				
		arriller. Note the attached	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in A ity documents have been	pplication No. <u>10/773749</u> .					
Attachment	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list  (s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)		received ummary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/773,749 Page 2

Art Unit: 2831

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lapp et al. (6,417,453) in view of Sotolongo.

Regarding claim 1, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses a hood-shaped cover (UK) comprising a device-proximal bottom side (figure 1) and a device-distal side (figure 1), and a cable guide KE such that a plug-in connector (figure 2) of the connecting cable (col. 3, lines 15-16) is connectable to the electronic device (not shown), said cable guide KE including in the device-proximal bottom side (figure 1) an opening which is configured to extend toward the

Application/Control Number: 10/773,749

Art Unit: 2831

device-distal side (figure 1) into a passageway and terminates in a cable outlet KE disposed tangentially to the device-distal side (figure 1), but lacks an helically configured cable guide.

Sotolongo (col. 5, lines 44-50) teaches a helically configured cable guide 104.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Lapp et al. by providing a helically configured cable guide in order to provide a continuous enclosure about the cable in view of the teachings of Sotolongo.

Regarding claim 2, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses a lid closure (figure 2).

Regarding claim 3, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the cable outlet KE is constructed so as to be tight and strain-relieved (col. 3, lines 47-50).

Regarding claims 4 and 12, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the lid closure (figures 3 and 4) is constructed as clamp element (figures 3 and 4).

Regarding claims 5 and 13, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the lid closure (figures 3 and 4) and the cover UK have aligned bores.

Regarding claim 6, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the cover HK includes a shield HM which extends above the opening KE.

Regarding claim 7, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the shield HM has an attachment member (figure 5).

Regarding claim 8, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the shield HM has a recessed end surface (figure 5) in proximity of the cable outlet KE to define said passageway (figure 5).

Regarding claim 9, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the cable outlet KE is constructed in the form of a tray.

Regarding claim 10, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses a cover UK and a flexible electrical cable (col. 3, lines 15-16) secured to the electronic device (not shown) and the cover UK, said cover UK including a hood-shaped cover portion (figure 1) constructed and formed with a cutout (figure 1) having a device-proximal bottom area (figure 1) and a device-distal upper area (figure 1), and a cable guide KE disposed in the area of the cutout (figure 1), said cable guide KE including an opening (figure 2) disposed in the device-proximal bottom area (figure 1) and extended by a slot FN and a cable outlet KE disposed in the device-distal area (figure 1) in proximity of the slot FN, but lacks a cable guide extended by a curved slot.

Sotolongo (figure 2) teaches a cable guide 2 extended by a curved slot 50.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Lapp et al. by providing a cable guide extended by a curved slot in order to provide cable strain relief in view of the teachings of Sotolongo.

Regarding claim 11, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the cover UK includes a lid closure (figure 2).

Regarding claim 14, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the cover HK includes a shield HM which extends substantially above the slot FN of the opening KE.

Regarding claim 15, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the shield HM has an attachment member (figure 5).

Regarding claim 16, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the shield HM has a recessed end surface (figure 5) in proximity of the cable outlet KE to define a passageway FN.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,749 Page 5

Art Unit: 2831

Regarding claim 17, Lapp et al. (col. 3, lines 10-67) discloses that the cable outlet KE is constructed in the form of a tray.

## Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 07 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the Lapp reference that there is no structure provided that would allow for guidance of a cable, Examiner disagrees. Lapp discloses a cable opening KE, which has to guide the cable into and/or out of the housing. Therefore, KE of Lapp is interpreted as the cable guide.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Lapp reference relates to the problem of guiding a cable. The Sontolongo reference relates to how a cable is guided helically. Therefore, the motivation found in Sontolongo of providing a continuous enclosure about the cable provides a rationale for combining the two aforementioned references.

#### Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/773,749 Page 6

Art Unit: 2831

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Anton B Harris whose telephone number is (571) 272-1976. The

examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr.

Dean Reichard, can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

abh

8/16/06

UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800